

### REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, and 15 remain withdrawn.

### Amendment

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 11 have been amended to further improve their form and clarity. Specifically, the claims now clarify that “one of the plurality of information processing apparatus” in the last paragraph refers to --the one information processing apparatus-- that received the download start request for resource data. See at least Fig. 7 and page 25, the first full paragraph, for support. No new matter has been introduced.

### Art Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ikeno (USP 7,154,617) in view of Holmstead (USPGP 2004/0024844).

In the last reply, applicant explained to the examiner that Holmstead does not disclose or teach preventing downloading of resources when a print job currently exists in a storage device. Applicant explained that Holmstead merely discloses matching the print job elements (such as photos or images) for the current print job with previously stored print job elements. If there is no match, Holmstead calls for downloading the print job elements for the current print job. Otherwise, the stored print job elements are retrieved from a storage device for the current job. Applicant also explained that Holmstead's Fig. 4 has nothing to do with whether a print job currently exists in a storage device, and that Holmstead rather merely discloses using the resources that exist in its storage device instead of downloading them to expedite the printing processing. In response, the examiner asserts that Holmstead's paragraphs 47, 51, 53, and Fig. 4 disclose the claimed downloading-preventing feature.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11 call for determining whether a print job received from one of a plurality of information processing apparatuses exists in a storage device when a download start request for resource data has been received from one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses. These claims further calls for informing the one information processing apparatus from which the download start request for resource data has been received that downloading of the resource data is not possible when the received print job exists in the storage device. This notification to the operator of the information processing apparatus that transmitted the download start request for resource data alerts that downloading of the resource data is not possible due to the existence of the print job in the storage device.

Referring to Ikeno's Fig. 39, if step S3511 determines that the data sent to its resource port 3411 is the data that aims at downloading resources, a print job acceptance stop instruction is issued (S3512) and any print job remaining in a print queue buffer 3415 is monitored (S3513). If any print job remains in the print queue buffer 3415, the data sent to the resource port 3411 (downloaded data, resource data) is prevented from being stored in an appropriate storage area 3419. If no print job is present in the print queue buffer 3415, the resource data will be stored in the appropriate storage area 3419, thereby updating resource data. See column 16, lines 15 to 27.

Ikeno thus discloses determining whether or not a print job exists in the print queue buffer in response to reception of the downloaded data. But Ikeno fails to disclose or teach informing the PC from which a downloaded start request for data has been received (among a plurality of PCs) that downloading of the data is not possible due to the print job existing in the print queue buffer.

Holmstead discloses searching a particular directory A-D into which a local memory 302 is segmented each time a print job ticket 500 is received to determine if a print job element 504 referenced by the ticket already exists in local memory 302. See paragraph 0047. Holmstead also discloses having a printer 100 retrieve one or more print job elements from the local memory 302, instead of downloading them from a remote site(s) 202, if the print job element referenced by the ticket matches the print job element stored in the local memory 302. See paragraph 0040 and Figs. 4 and 8.

Holmstead, however, fails to disclose or teach determining whether or not a **print job** exists in the local memory 302. Rather, it merely discloses determining whether or not the print job element necessary for executing the print job exists in the local memory 302.

Moreover, even if assuming for argument's sake that a print job element is equivalent to a print job, Holmstead still fails to teach informing the information processing apparatus from which a download start request for a print job has been received that downloading of the print job is not possible when the print job element exists in the local memory 302.

Based on the foregoing, even if the combination urged by the examiner is deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination still would not have taught at least the informing or notifying aspect set forth in each of independent claims 1, 6, and 11.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

01 APRIL 2009

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150  
ASHBURN, VA 20147  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)